

App. No. 10/049174
Office Action Dated May 21, 2004
Amd. Dated September 30, 2004

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claims 1, 3, 5 and 12 have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "the reciprocating movement is substantially perpendicular to the sheet metal, support is in Figures 2 and 3 of the claimed invention. Claims 3, 5 and 12 have been amended editorially. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are pending.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Applicant respectfully traverses the objection. The distance between the first and second parts should be 0.3-3.0mm (page 2, line 38). In view the drawings, it would be clear to one skilled in the art that the wheels, by necessity, must protrude from the housing, a distance that corresponds to the distance between the first and second part. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 7.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 11 is supported at page 2, line 38 of the present application, the distance between the first and second part is 0.3-3.0mm. It would be clear to one skilled in the art that distance the wheels protrude from the housing would correlate to the distance between the first and second part. Withdrawal and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Withdrawal and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

App. No. 10/049174
Office Action Dated May 21, 2004
Amd. Dated September 30, 2004

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 9, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jonsson (US 4,565,084). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is direct to an arrangement in a sheet-metal forming tool (7). The sheet-metal forming tool (7) comprises a first part (2) for performing a reciprocating movement substantially perpendicular to the sheet metal, produced by means of a drive arrangement (3), in relation to a second part (4). The running surface faces the wheel (5a), defining the reciprocating movement of the first part (2).

Jonsson teaches a tool (3) for bending the edge of a thick sheet of metal (1), where the sheet of metal (1) rests on a horizontal support table (2). The tool comprises a J-shaped yoke (4) with a long leg (4a) and a short leg (4b). The tool (3) is placed in a position so as to straddle the edge of the sheet metal (1). The tool is provided with transport wheels (6) on spaced-apart shafts (7). The shafts (7) are drivably connected to a power transmission means (10), which is coupled with a drive motor (11), which is the drive equipment for automatically moving the tool on the sheet (1) for aligning the tool along the edge of the sheet metal, Figure 1. Once the tool is aligned, the tool (3) is tilted to bend the sheet when a cylinder (21) is pressurized and a piston rod (23) is pressed down against the upper surface of the sheet (1), whereby the tool (3) is made to tilt from the starting position shown in Figure 2 to a position shown in Figure 3.

In view of the above, the reciprocating motion that the Examiner appears to be referring to is the movement of the tool (3) along the edge of the sheet metal (1) for the positioning of the tool. This motion is only for positioning, the forming of the sheet metal is done by creating a moment about an axis of the yoke (4). Jonsson fails to teach or suggest performing a reciprocating movement substantially perpendicular to the sheet

App. No. 10/049174
Office Action Dated May 21, 2004
Amd. Dated September 30, 2004

metal, for forming or machining a held sheet. Thus, Jonsson fails to anticipate claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 9, 10 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1. For the reasons discussed above for claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jonsson in view of Kobayashi et al. (US 6,589,664). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 7 depends indirectly from claim 1. For the reasons discussed above for claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Kobayashi does not remedy the deficiency of Jonsson.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions or concerns regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, John J. Grosens, Reg. No. 33,112, at (612)371.5265.


Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300



Dated: September 30, 2004

JJG:mmm

By 
John J. Grosens
Reg. No. 33,112